

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING	G DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,243	12/05/2003		Mark Edward Riehl	NNI-0006	1171
23377	7590	06/16/2005		EXAMINER	
WOODCOC				LACYK, JOHN P	
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, 46TH FLOOR 1650 MARKET STREET				ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103				3736	

DATE MAILED: 06/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Office Action Comments	10/729,243	RIEHL ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit					
	John P. Lacyk	3736					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	i6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONED	ely filed  will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication.  (35 U.S.C. § 133).					
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on	_•						
2a) ☐ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) ☒ This	action is non-final.						
·	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the ments is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-70 is/are rejected. 7) □ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	,						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.							
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.</li> </ul>							
Attachment(s)							
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date							
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 11/22/04; 2/22/05.  Statement(s) (PTO-152) Other:							

Art Unit: 3736

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1-70 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-67 of copending Application No. 10/657,296. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a method and system for reducing discomfort caused by transcutaneous stimulation by providing a transcutaneous stimulation to a first location and providing a stimulation at a second location to reduce discomfort at the first location caused by the transcutaneous stimulation.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

3. Claims 1-70 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-72 of copending Application No. 10/792,994. Although the conflicting claims are not identical.

Art Unit: 3736

they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both claim a method and system for reducing discomfort caused by transcutaneous stimulation by providing a transcutaneous stimulation to a first location and providing a stimulation at a second location to reduce discomfort at the first location caused by the transcutaneous stimulation.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

- 4. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

  The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
- 5. Claims 1-39, 49-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claim 1 is unclear in that it appears that the step of applying an electrical signal to a second location is the same as the step of reducing the discomfort since the applying of the electrical signal is what is reducing the discomfort and if not then the step of reducing the discomfort is incomplete in that it is unclear how reducing step is performed. Similarly with claim 25, in that the step of applying a substance would be the same as the step of reducing the discomfort. Claims 49-51 should recite "at least one conductor" as defined in claim 40 since there could only be one and not plural conductors as defined by the language of claim 40.

Application/Control Number: 10/729,243 Page 4

Art Unit: 3736

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 40-41, 44-47, 68 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Edrich et al.

Edrich et al teaches a device for providing magnetic stimulation having a magnetic stimulation device for treating a first location (horizontal coil 11), what is considered to be "at least one conductor (vertical coil 12) that is in communication with a signal generator that would be needed to provide an electric current to the coil, which would carry the electrical signal to the second location. With regard to claims 44-46 these are merely directed to where on the body the device is placed and the Edrich et al device is clearly capable of being placed anywhere on the body.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John P. Lacyk whose telephone number is 571-272-4728. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri, 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Max Hindenburg can be reached on 571-272-4726. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

John P Lacyk

Primary Examiner Art Unit 3736

J.P. Lacyk